

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

FILED BY *[Signature]* D.C.

05 JUL 22 PM 2: 36

MARTIN NOLAN, et al.,)
Plaintiffs,)
vs.)
MEMPHIS CITY SCHOOLS, et al.,)
Defendants.)
)
)

THOMAS M. GOULD
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
W/D OF TN, MEMPHIS

Civ. No. 04-3047-D/P

SCHEDULING ORDER

Pursuant to written notice, a scheduling conference was set for July 21, 2005. Prior to the conference, William T. Winchester, counsel for plaintiffs, and Michael R. Marshall and Cheryl R. Estes, counsel for defendants submitted a joint proposed order which was approved by the Court. The following dates were established as the final dates for:

INITIAL DISCLOSURES PURSUANT TO Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(a)(1):
August 12, 2005

JOINING PARTIES: September 23, 2005

AMENDING PLEADINGS: October 7, 2005

INITIAL MOTIONS TO DISMISS: September 9, 2005

COMPLETING ALL DISCOVERY: May 31, 2006

(a) DOCUMENT PRODUCTION: May 5, 2006

This document entered on the docket sheet in compliance
with Rule 58 and/or 79(a) FRCP on *7/28/05* *[Signature]* *D*

(b) DEPOSITIONS, INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS: May 5, 2006

(c) EXPERT WITNESS DISCLOSURE (Rule 26):

- (1) DISCLOSURE OF PLAINTIFF'S RULE 26 EXPERT INFORMATION:** March 1, 2006
- (2) DISCLOSURE OF DEFENDANT'S RULE 26 EXPERT INFORMATION:** March 31, 2006
- (3) RULE 26(e) SUPPLEMENTATION:** April 14, 2006
- (4) EXPERT WITNESS DEPOSITIONS:** March 31, 2006

FILING DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS: June 16, 2006

OTHER RELEVANT MATTERS:

Certain defendants were only recently served, and, therefore, the court finds a sufficient basis to extend deadlines beyond the time allowed under the Civil Justice Reform Act.

No depositions may be scheduled to occur after the discovery cutoff date. All motions, requests for admissions, or other filings that require a response must be filed sufficiently in advance of the discovery cutoff date to enable opposing counsel to respond by the time permitted by the Rules prior to that date.

Motions to compel discovery are to be filed and served by the discovery deadline or within 30 days of the default or the service of the response, answer, or objection, which is the subject of the motion, if the default occurs within 30 days of the discovery deadline, unless the time for filing of such motion is extended for good cause shown, or the objection to the default, response, answer, or objection shall be waived.

This case is set for a jury trial. The pretrial order date, pretrial conference date, and trial date will be set by the presiding judge. It is anticipated that the trial will last approximately five (5) days.

Settlement cannot be evaluated at this time.

The parties are reminded that pursuant to Local Rule 11(a)(1)(A), all motions, except motions pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12, 56, 59, and 60 shall be accompanied by a proposed order.

The opposing party may file a response to any motion filed in this matter. Neither party may file an additional reply, however, without leave of the court. If a party believes that a reply is necessary, it shall file a motion for leave to file a reply accompanied by a memorandum setting forth the reasons for which a reply is required.

The parties do not consent to all matters being conducted by a magistrate judge.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



TU M. PHAM
United States Magistrate Judge

July 22, 2005
Date



Notice of Distribution

This notice confirms a copy of the document docketed as number 11 in case 2:04-CV-03047 was distributed by fax, mail, or direct printing on July 28, 2005 to the parties listed.

Cheryl R. Estes

THOMASON HENDRIX HARVEY JOHNSON & MITCHELL
40 South Main Street
Ste. 2900
Memphis, TN 38103

William T. Winchester

THE LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM T. WINCHESTER
2600 Poplar Ave.
Ste. 507
Memphis, TN 38112

Michael R. Marshall

STOKES BARTHOLOMEW EVANS & PETREE, P.A.
1000 Ridgeway Loop Rd.
Ste. 200
Memphis, TN 38120

Honorable Bernice Donald

US DISTRICT COURT